



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society to the Massachusetts Legislature, incorporating the action of the Legislature thereon, may be had on application to the Society's office. Let there be an active campaign everywhere in behalf of this next great step forward in the development of the federation and peace of the world.

Favorable Reception of the Proposition for a Regular International Congress.

The proposition for a regular congress of representatives of the nations of the world, of the type outlined in the American Peace Society's Memorial to the Massachusetts Legislature, has met with unexpectedly large and cordial favor. Wherever the character of it has been clearly and fully grasped, approval has been in almost every case immediate and pronounced. The only question raised about it, and that by comparatively few persons, — that special congresses of the kind heretofore held are better, — was dealt with in our last issue.

That the proposition should have gone, with no opposition whatever, through the Massachusetts Legislature, composed of two hundred and eighty members, in the hands of every one of whom a copy of the memorial was placed, is sufficiently extraordinary, considering the nature of the subject. It was expected that a portion of them, at any rate, would consider the scheme wholly chimerical and oppose it.

Outside of the Legislature, in the State and in the country at large, approval of the idea has been quite as generous, wherever it has come to the knowledge of the thoughtful people of the nation. It seems certain now to be generally indorsed as fast as it becomes known. We quote a few expressions of opinion, on the part of individuals and of the press, in addition to those given last month:

The Boston *Transcript*, in an editorial notice immediately after the action of the Legislature, says: "Upon the undoubted merits of this movement we have several times commented. Of course this action settles nothing, but it initiates, strongly and cordially, a movement which we trust will eventually attain the purpose outlined. It puts Massachusetts on record in the right way, and is renewed evidence of progress toward a regulation of the world's affairs by mutual consent and by peaceful methods. *The Legislature has not done a better piece of work this session.*"

The Boston *Beacon* says: "In no way could our government manifest to the world more clearly its sincere purpose to deal justly with all nations than by adopting the suggestion of the American Peace Society and inviting the different governments to unite in the establishment of an international congress, to meet at stated intervals."

The *Watchman*, while declaring that the average

legislator takes no real interest in such matters, speaks thus: "It can hardly be denied that the indications are more auspicious than ever before in modern times for the successful establishment of such a congress. The idea of international arbitration has prevailed beyond the expectation of many of its most sanguine advocates. The inauguration of the Hague Tribunal was a long step in advance, and perhaps that work may yet be regarded as one of the most signal achievements of the marvelous nineteenth century. . . . In a large sense it may be said that the Hague Tribunal logically anticipates and assumes the existence of such an international congress as the background of its international judication. Certainly such a congress would be the most effective aid to the Tribunal."

The *Christian Intelligencer* says that the reasons given by the American Peace Society for its proposition are "cogent."

Joshua L. Bailly, a distinguished business man of Philadelphia, says: "The general purpose and scope of your proposition commends itself to my approval." So also writes President Thwing of Western Reserve University.

Professor A. M. Elliott of Johns Hopkins University writes: "I am thoroughly in accord with the sentiment of the Memorial that the time has arrived when such congress may be held at regular intervals; and shall be greatly pleased to call the attention of all my friends to this important step forward in the right direction."

Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, the most representative woman in America, writes as follows: "The Memorial of the American Peace Society to the Massachusetts Legislature, proposing that it take the initiative in establishing regular international congresses, fills me with gladness and hope. No recent movement in the interest of the world's peace seems so promising and so certain to meet with general favor. . . . The Hague Peace Conference has familiarized the people, as no previous occurrence has done, with the blessed efficacy of international congresses in settling controversies among nations that might otherwise be fomented into war. And the time is opportune for the establishment of a permanent and regular international congress, whose influence will make for friendliness among the nations, the expansion of the present narrow, petty nationalism into a broad and enlightened cosmopolitanism, and the cultivation of peace — *the peace of the world.*"

Washington's Anti-Militarism.

George Washington, whose birthday the people have just been again celebrating, was not only the first citizen of the country after it had returned to a state of peace, but he was one of the first in the nation to throw his weighty influence on the side of the abolition of militarism and war.

Washington was an experienced soldier and general, and believed that war was sometimes a dire necessity, but he had no love for it and despised all the so-called "glory" of it. He believed in what he called a "proper peace establishment," but he wished this limited strictly to purposes of police and self-defense.

There is nothing which would have been more distasteful to the "Father of his Country" than the incessant glorification of his military achievements, in which the people of the land have indulged since his death, to the neglect often of all his higher and finer qualities, both as a citizen and a statesman.

If the first president of the Republic were living to-day he would be at the very front in the promotion of every type of international conduct and institution which would tend to make war henceforth impossible. He would be among the strongest and most outspoken of the opponents of everything savoring in the least of imperialism, in the current sense of the word, and of every movement toward great military and naval establishments for this country.

His opinions on these subjects, expressed frequently after the close of the Revolution, have been either suppressed or ignored by most of his recent biographers. In so able a work as Senator Lodge's "Life of Washington" in the American Statesmen Series, I find no reference in the index from "peace" or "war" to his peace sentiments, though Washington ranked these among the most important of his views. We give herewith some of his most remarkable utterances on the subject.

In a letter of July 25, 1785, to David Humphreys, Secretary of the Commission sent abroad to negotiate treaties of commerce, he wrote: "My first wish is to see this plague to mankind (war) banished from the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed in more pleasing and innocent amusements than in preparing implements and exercising them for the destruction of mankind." *My first wish!* What a place, then, it held in his thoughts and feelings! What fine irony there is in the words "pleasing and innocent amusements!"

In a letter, in October of the same year, to the Marquis de la Rouerie, an officer just appointed to the command of a French army corps, he said: "My first wish is (although it is against the profession of arms, and would clip the wings of some of your young soldiers who are soaring after glory) to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind."

In a letter to Lafayette in January, 1788, he wrote: "Would to God the harmony of nations were an object that lay nearest to the hearts of sovereigns, and that the incentives to peace, of which commerce and facility of understanding each other are not the most inconsiderable, might be daily increased!"

To the Marquis de Chastellux, who had just taken to himself a wife, he wrote in April of the same year, while "the great personages of the North" of Europe "were making war under the . . . infatuation of Mars:" "Now, for my part, I humbly conceive that you have acted much the best and wisest part, for certainly it is more consonant to all the principles of reason and religion, natural and revealed, to replenish the earth with inhabitants than to depopulate it by killing those already in existence. Besides, it is time for the age of knight-errantry and mad heroism to be at an end. Your young military men, who want to reap the harvest of laurels, do not care, I suppose, how many seeds of war are sown; but for the sake of humanity it is devoutly to be wished that the manly employment of agriculture and the humanizing benefits of commerce would supersede the waste of war and the rage of conquest; that the swords might be turned into ploughshares, the spears into pruning hooks, and, as the Scriptures express it, 'The nations learn war no more.'"

In June of 1788, in another letter to Lafayette, he wrote: "There seems to be a great deal of bloody work cut out for this summer in the north of Europe. If war, want and plague are to desolate those huge armies that are assembled, who, that has the feelings of a man, can refrain from shedding a tear over the miserable victims of regal ambition? It is really a strange thing that there should not be room enough in the world for men to live without cutting one another's throats."

Washington's views on entangling foreign alliances, goodwill and friendliness toward all peoples, and great military establishments, are better known than these his general peace sentiments. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, who considered war to be the "greatest of human evils," he wrote, in August, 1788: "In whatever manner the nations of Europe shall endeavor to keep up their prowess in war and their balance of power in peace, it will be obviously our policy to cultivate tranquillity at home and abroad, and to extend our agriculture and commerce as far as possible."

To the Count de Rochambeau he wrote, in January, 1789: "Notwithstanding it might probably, in a commercial view, be greatly for the advantage of America that a war should rage on the other side of the Atlantic, yet I shall never so far divest myself of the feelings of a man interested in the happiness of his fellowmen as to wish my country's prosperity might be built on the ruins of that of other nations."

In his "farewell address," in which he uttered his oft-quoted warning against entanglements in the affairs of foreign nations, he spoke with the deepest wisdom as well as feeling on the subject of the dangers of great armaments: "Overgrown military establishments are under any form of government

inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

If Washington were with us now, and were responding to the eloquent eulogies pronounced on his anniversary, it is certain that the noble sentiments quoted above are those of his principles on which he would lay a strong and peculiar emphasis. There is not the least doubt as to the stand he would without hesitation take on all the questions now agitating the public mind as to our world-destiny and our relations to the other nations of the earth. The principles and policies on which he helped to found the nation he would declare in the most unequivocal terms to be the ones on whose sacred preservation and use the future strength, greatness and honor of the Republic depend.

Policing Our Fears.

As was to be expected, the recent Venezuelan disturbance has stirred up all the naval promoters as they have not been stirred up for a long time, and they are moving heaven and earth to get a large immediate increase of the navy, both in ships and in men. The House Naval Affairs Committee's bill provides for doubling the number of cadets at Annapolis, and for four new fighting vessels, three battleships and one armored cruiser. At this writing vigorous effort is being made in the Senate to get four battleships ordered. Of the proposed naval appropriation of about eighty-one millions of dollars, thirty millions is for new construction. The bill is now certain to pass Congress with little change.

The Naval Board has gone so far as openly to advocate the adoption of a program of naval extension which will in eight years, if adopted, cost the nation three hundred and twenty millions of dollars, and make the American fleet-of-war vessels the greatest in the world. This purpose, which has evidently been in mind for years, has been skillfully kept out of sight till now. But the promoters have felt sufficiently sure of the public in recent weeks to come boldly out with their entire scheme. And the pity of it is that the people, without any serious thought on the subject, are ready to accept practically whatever these professionalists propose.

So far as the recent events are concerned, the ground for urging increase of the navy is the alleged certainty of impending complications with European powers in South America, particularly with Germany, and possibly with Great Britain. But what these complications are to be, and how they are to come about, we are not informed. All sorts of suspicions are whispered against Germany, and all kinds of evil intentions attributed to her, in spite of her repeated denials, which the government at Washington professes to believe. The revelation that England, not Germany, was at the bottom of the movement to

compel by force the payment of obligations by Venezuela has not had the slightest influence in allaying the terrible fears of these hankers after a big navy. England is known always to have respected, and still to respect, the Monroe Doctrine, but this knowledge has no effect on these men.

The fact is that, when properly understood, there has been nothing in the recent Venezuelan events, however brutal and inhuman they may have been, to afford the shadow of a reason for our building an increased number of costly warships. No such combination as that of England and Germany against a South American state is likely to occur again, and even if it did, why should more war ships be needed than were needed this time—if the United States warships had anything to do with the affair?

Still less tenable is the more common reason given for enlarging the navy, the necessity of policing the seas and protecting our commerce. The *Outlook*, in a recent number, commenting on a remark of Lord Charles Beresford about a navy being odious "if it isn't for the rate of insurance" on commerce, and "for defense," voices this argument: "If the object of the United States in increasing and strengthening the navy were to establish international political rivalry with other countries (in addition to the commendable commercial rivalry already established), then the policy of such an increase would be wrong; but if the necessity of policing the ocean is more and more evident, then there should be a corresponding augmentation of our navy."

What makes the necessity of policing the ocean more and more evident? It would be difficult for the *Outlook* to give a single fact, or group of facts, on which to base this assertion. The danger to commerce to-day on the high seas is indefinitely less than at any time in the past, when we had a small navy. Piracy is gone. There is not a ghost of probability, as the *Outlook* would be quick to confess, that the English, Russians, French, Italians, or anybody else, would seize our goods and merchant vessels anywhere on the ocean, if every American warship were taken off the water. Commerce—the commerce of any and every nation, if it behaves itself—goes to-day, free and safe, everywhere. The amount of trouble to commerce or to travelers in ports of entry is less now than it ever was before, and affords no ground for naval increase.

No; civilization is advancing, not receding, and there is less reason for increasing protection of commerce in this age than ever before in the world's history, just as there is less reason for augmenting national defenses. The facts are all against the *Outlook's* position; they demand a decrease rather than an increase of warships. It does not seem to us to be very worthy of a great, progressive, civilized nation to sink millions and millions yearly in great fighting craft to police our suspicions and our fears.